

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the appeal brief filed on January 28, 2008. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 12, 13, and 16-20 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 17 includes a "computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poisner, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,776 further in view of Benson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,470,079.

Poisner teaches the invention substantially as claimed including the field of automatic monitoring control of devices by a central computer that accesses a remote database (see abstract).

As to claims 1 and 17, Poisner teaches a method for reporting to requesting subscribers about peripheral device events, the method comprising:

maintaining subscription profiles for the subscribers and periodic subscription reports that can be provided to the subscribers, each profile specifying what peripheral device event information the subscriber wishes to receive (col. 4, lines 30-56, Poisner discloses users receiving periodic reports based on information collected in the database).

gathering event data from a plurality of devices relating to peripheral device events that have occurred at the peripheral devices (col. 4, lines 30-33, Poisner discloses a database collecting information regarding the maintenance and usage history of devices);

saving the event data to a database (col. 4, lines 30-33);

automatically sending to designated subscribers notification according to criteria contained in the subscriber profiles (col. 4, lines 50-56, Poisner discloses users automatically receiving reports based on information collected in the database); and,

automatically generating periodic subscription reports at regular periodic intervals according to criteria contained in the subscriber profiles and automatically sending the periodic subscription reports to designated subscribers according to criteria contained in

the subscriber profiles (col. 4, lines 41-56, Poisner discloses periodic reports generated).

Poisner fails to teach the limitation further including profiles that indicate the subscribers' preferences in regard to event notification and the format in which the subscriber wishes to receive the peripheral device event information; sending event notifications to subscribers upon occurrence of the peripheral device events; and separate from sending the event notifications, generating reports.

However, Benson teaches a system and method for real time reporting of advertising effectiveness (see abstract). Benson teaches the use of a subscriber requesting a particular report, which creates a subscriber profile, receiving the report at predetermined intervals and in the format desired by the subscriber, sending immediate notifications, upon occurrence of an event, to subscribers regarding specific reports, and generating reports separate from the immediate notifications (col. 2, lines 31-40; col. 6, line 46 - col. 7, line 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Poisner in view of Benson to include profiles that indicate the subscribers' preferences in regard to event notification and the format in which the subscriber wishes to receive the peripheral device event information; sending event notifications to subscribers upon occurrence of the peripheral device events; and separate from sending the event notifications, generating reports. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for important notifications to be sent immediately.

Regarding claim 2, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 1 wherein the event data comprises information relating to any one from the group of region, manufacture, model or customer identification (col. 4, lines 30-34, Poisner discloses information collected related to the manufacturer of the device).

Regarding claim 3, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 1 wherein the periodic subscription reports comprise information in the form of text, tables, charts and/or graphs (col. 4, lines 41-56).

4. Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 13, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poisner and Benson further in view of Grasso et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,892,909.

Poisner teaches the invention substantially as claimed including the field of automatic monitoring control of devices by a central computer that accesses a remote database (see abstract). Benson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for real time reporting of advertising effectiveness (see abstract).

As to claims claim 5, Poisner and Benson teach the method according to claim 1

Poisner and Benson fail to teach the limitation further including the limitations further comprising the steps: receiving a request to set up or change a subscriber

profile; receiving new subscriber information and entering it to a subscriber profile; and saving the new subscriber profile.

However, Grasso teaches systems and methods for managing delivery of time-sensitive business-critical information to multiple individuals located at various locations (see abstract). Grasso teaches the use of subscriber profiles that can be modified and receive new information that is saved (col. 13, lines 15-35; col. 13, line 54 – col. 14, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Poisner and Benson in view of Grasso to receive a request to set up or change a subscriber profile; receive new subscriber information and enter it to a subscriber profile; and save the new subscriber profile to the manufacturing repository. One would be motivated to do so because it would allow for accurate corrections and new additions to the subscriber database.

Regarding claim 6, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 5 wherein said step of entering new subscriber information:

entering contact information of a subscriber (col. 13, line 54 – col. 14, line 7, Grasso discloses addresses entered of the recipient);

entering the subscriber's desired notification request (col. 24, lines 17-35, Grasso discloses the ability to change notification preferences);

entering subscription report criteria (Poisner, col. 4, lines 41-56); and

entering a designated time cycle for subscription report (Poisner, col. 4, lines 41-56).

Regarding claim 7, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 6 wherein the time cycle includes any one from the group of none, daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly or yearly (Poisner, col. 4, lines 41-56).

Regarding claims 10 and 18, Poisner teaches the method and computer program according to claims 1 and 17 wherein automatically sending to designated subscribers event notifications comprises:

searching a subscriber profile for notification requests for the event data according to the requested criteria;

determining whether there is any notification requests for the event data;

composing notifications for each notification request determined in the subscriber profile; and

sending out the notifications to the requesting subscriber (Poisner, col. 4, lines 30-56; Grasso, col. 13, lines 15-35; col. 13, line 54 – col. 14, line 7; col. 24, lines 17-35).

Regarding claim 12, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 10 wherein the requested criteria includes any one from the group of event occurrence by page count, event occurrence by region, event occurrence by manufacturing information,

event occurrence by device model, or event occurrence by customer (Poisner, col. 4, lines 30-56).

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Poisner teaches the method and computer program of claims 1 and 17 the method according to claim 1 wherein automatically generating periodic subscription reports comprises:

- searching a subscriber profile for any scheduled subscription report due;
- determining whether there is any scheduled subscription report due; and
- accessing information relating to the subscriber of any predetermined scheduled subscription report due (Poisner, col. 4, lines 30-56; Grasso, col. 13, lines 15-35; col. 13, line 54 – col. 14, line 7; col. 24, lines 17-35).

Regarding claim 16, Poisner teaches the method according to claim 13 further comprising:

- sorting the information for the scheduled subscription report according to criteria of the requesting subscriber profile; and
- formatting the information to generate the report (Grasso, col. 13, lines 15-35; col. 13, line 54 – col. 14, line 7; col. 24, lines 17-35).

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poisner and Benson further in view of Barrett et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,568,612

Poisner teaches the invention substantially as claimed including the field of automatic monitoring control of devices by a central computer that accesses a remote database (see abstract). Benson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for real time reporting of advertising effectiveness (see abstract).

As to claims 20, Poisner teaches the method of claim 1.

Poisner fails to teach the limitation further including wherein the event data comprises one or more of paper jams, low memory conditions, and undefined paper size conditions.

However, Barrett teaches a method and apparatus for advertising services of two network servers from a single network node (see abstract). Barrett teaches the use of status control information including paper jam and paper size (col. 14, lines 19-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Poisner in view of Barrett to use event data comprising one or more of paper jams, low memory conditions, and undefined paper size conditions. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for tracking of usage and statistics (Barrett, col. 14, lines 42-43).

Response to Arguments

6. In view of the appeal brief filed on January 28, 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth above.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,516,427 to Keyes et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,247 to Motoyama et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,587,735 to Yaguchi.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,155,842 to Rubin.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,004 to Zintel

U.S. Pat. No. 6,310,692 to Fan et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,647,056 to Barrett et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,799,206 to Kitagawa et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,421 to Chapman et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AVI GOLD whose telephone number is (571)272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157